

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/439,626 | 11/12/1999 | JACQUES H. HELOT | 109911266-1 | 1876 | |
| 22879 | 7590 05/20/2002 | | | | |
| HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | JAKETIC, BRYAN J | | |
| FORT COLLI | NS, CO 80527-2400 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3627 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 05/20/2002 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | 09/439,626 | HELOT ET AL. | NA | | | | | |
| | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | | |
| | | Bryan Jaketic | 3627 | | | | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | | | |
| A SHOTHE I - Exter after - if the - if NO - Failu - Any r | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing | 36(a). In no event, however, may a rep within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI cause the application to become ABA | oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this common NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | nunication. | | | | | |
| Status | ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 A | April 2002 . | | | | | | | |
| 2a)⊠ | This action is FINAL . 2b) Th | is action is non-final. | | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | | | |
| · | on of Claims | | | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | | |
| · | Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | r clastica requirement | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers | | | | | | | | | |
| | The specification is objected to by the Examine | r. | | | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>12 November 1999</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | | | |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | | | | |
| 12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | | | |
| 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | | | | | | | |
| Attachmen | t(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 2) D Notic | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _ | 5) Notice of In | ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). formal Patent Application (PTO-1 | | | | | | |
| S Datent and To | rademark Office | | | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/439,626

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. Smith et al disclose a computer implemented method for remote ordering (see col. 3, lines 39-41) comprising the steps of providing graphical selection of a plurality of options for a base component in an interactive environment, overlaying selected options on the item, and graphically updating the consumer item on the visual display (col. 9, lines 44-57). A user interface (100) presents information about the

Application/Control Number: 09/439,626

Art Unit: 3627

consumer item. The user may not select invalid options that don't conform with previously selected options (col. 9, lines 58-64).

Smith et al do not disclose the steps of dragging and dropping the options, updating the consumer item in real-time, and using the Internet to place the order. However, it is common in the art to drag items, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the step of dragging and dropping the option to allow the user flexibility in its placement. Real-time updating is also common in the art, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill I nthe art at the time the invention was made to update the consumer in real-time to allow the consumer to quickly see the updated product. It is also common in the art to order items via the Internet. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to send the order to the manufacturer via the Internet because the Internet allows efficient transfer of information.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 30 April 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that col. 10, lines 49-58 of Smith et al teach against the claimed invention. Applicant interprets the section to mean that the graphical display is updated at a later time. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The cited section of Smith et al states that further adjustments may be made at a later time. Examiner does not interpret this to mean that the graphical display is not updated until such a time. As Examiner understands the disclosure, the graphical display is updated even if the

Application/Control Number: 09/439,626

Art Unit: 3627

configuration shown may not be feasibly built. The user then invokes the checker module "which ensures validity of the **depicted** configuration" (col. 10, lines 64-65, emphasis added). Accordingly, the system does not wait for the checker module to be invoked before visually updating the graphical interface.

As Examiner understands the disclosure, the object of the invention of Smith et al is to quickly provide visual feedback of options that the user selects. Examiner maintains that real-time updating is common in the art. Therefore, Examiner further maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to accomplish this objective by providing real-time updates.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan Jaketic whose telephone number is (703) 308-0134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

bj May 17, 2002

> ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Del 5/17/01